

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

AMBER MARKS-THORNTON,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SEYANG JO,

Defendant and Appellant.

A155429

(Humboldt County
Super. Ct. No. CV180568)

MEMORANDUM OPINION¹

Seyang Jo appeals after the trial court issued a civil harassment restraining order prohibiting him from contacting, harassing, or being less than 100 yards from plaintiff Amber Marks-Thornton.

On appeal, we must presume the trial court's judgment is correct. (*Nielsen v. Gibson* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 318, 324.) An appellant has the burden to show error with an adequate record and to support any points made with citations to the record. (*Pringle v. La Chapelle* (1999) 73 Cal.App.4th 1000, 1003.) We may disregard assertions and arguments that lack record references or citations to legal authority. (*Cassidy v. California Bd. of Accountancy* (2013) 220 Cal.App.4th 620, 628.) These standards apply to litigants who act in propria person as well as those represented by counsel. (*Ibid.*; accord, *Nwosu v. Uba* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 1229, 1246-1247.)

¹ We resolve this case by a memorandum opinion pursuant to California Standards of Judicial Administration, section 8.1.

Based on these standards, we must affirm the order. Jo has not provided us with a reporter's transcript, clerk's transcript, or appendix. The only document we have before us is a copy of the restraining order itself. We have no basis to evaluate the procedural and substantive errors Jo asserts the trial court made.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

TUCHER, J.

WE CONCUR:

POLLAK, P. J.

STREETER, J.

Marks-Thornton v. Jo (A155429)